

U.S. General Accounting Office

GAO Survey of NPL-Eligible Sites: U.S. EPA



Introduction

The U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) examines issues for the U.S. Congress. We are conducting a review of contaminated sites that are considered "NPL-eligible." That is, these sites are found to be eligible for placement on the National Priorities List (NPL) after a site inspection by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). As part of our review, we are sending surveys to all EPA regions to request information on the individual sites located in their region. We are assessing the likelihood that sites will be placed on the NPL and the activities that are occurring to mitigate contamination at these sites.

This questionnaire asks about 1 of 3,000 NPL-eligible sites nationwide (as of October 8, 1997). In this questionnaire, we ask for information contained in your site inspection records. We are sending a similar survey to the appropriate state/territory/tribe to gain its perspective and to obtain additional information that they might have. Therefore, it is not necessary to consult with the state, territory, or tribe since they are also providing site information to us. Please have the most appropriate EPA staff fill out the questionnaire for the site indicated on the label.

Your response within 21 days of receiving this survey will help us avoid costly follow-ups. If the self-addressed business-reply envelope is missing, please return the questionnaire to the following address:

U.S. General Accounting Office Attn: Vincent Price 441 G Street NW, Room 2T23 Washington, DC 20548

If you have any questions, please call Vince Price at (202) 512-6529.

Thank you for your assistance.

Site name and location:

LOBUE #2 SAUK TRAIL RD CHICAGO HEIGHTS IL 60411

CERCLIS #: ILD980902050 GAO #: 1988-A

1. Please fill out the following in case we need to contact the person completing this survey.

Jan Pels 312/886-30

312/886-3009

Phone:

Name:

- 2. Please answer each question below to determine whether this site should be included in our survey. (Please circle answers.)
- a. Is site deferred to RCRA or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission?



b. Is site's preliminary Hazardous Ranking System score below 28.5? Yes No

c. Is site now designated as "no further remedial action planned" (NFRAP)? Yes

d. Is site now addressed as part of an existing NPL site?

Yes (No)

e. Is site proposed for the NPL?

Yes N

3. Did you answer "yes" for any item above? (Check one.)



Yes--> Please stop here and return this survey to us.



No --> Please continue with survey.

Please note: Because we don't know whose information is most current, we are also asking the state/territory/tribe for answers to Questions 4-8, 13-15, 17, and 19. So, if you do not have the information for those questions, there is no need to contact the state/territory/tribe for the answers.

Effects of site's contamination

			s contamination at this site affect? (Check one.)
1.	[}	1	Actual contamination Potential contamination
2.	[]	Potential contamination
3.	[]	No potential or actual contamination identified
4.	[]	Need more information to answer

5. How does contamination at this site affect *drinking water* (surface water or groundwater sources)? (Check one.)

5. [] Other (Please explain.)

[] Actual contamination
 [] Potential contamination
 [] No potential or actual contamination identified
 [] Need more information to answer

5. [] Other (Please explain.)

Site conditions

6.	Are	the	ere ar	ıy re	eside	ents	or	regula	ır em	ployees
wit	hin	0.5	mile	s of	the	site	? (Check	one.)

			Residents only
2.	1]	Employees only
3.	[]	Both residents and employees
4.	[]	Neither residents nor employees
5.	[]	Need more information to answer
6.	[3	Other (Please explain.)

7. Do your region's records and/or your knowledge of the site indicate that this site's contamination contributes to any of the following? (Check one for each row.)

	Vac	No	Uncertain	Other (Plane and in)
(Check one for each row.)	Yes (1)	No (2)	(3)	Other (Please explain.) (4)
Drinking water				·
a. Residents are advised not to use their wells.		X		
b. Residents are advised to use filtered water.		*		
c. Residents are advised to use bottled water.		Х		
d. Water supply is temporarily changed.		×		
e. Water supply is permanently changed.		×		
Other uses of water		,		
f. Livestock drink contaminated water.			λ	
g. Crops are irrigated with contaminated water.			×	
h. Fish could be unsafe to eat.	×			
i. Fish, plants, or animals are sick/dying.	×			
j. Recreation is stopped or restricted (e.g., fishing, swimming).		X		
k. Residents, workers, etc., use water that fails to meet water quality standards (e.g., for bathing, watering vegetable gardens, or landscaping).			×	

(Check one for each row.)	Yes (1)	No (2)	Uncertain (3)	Other (<i>Please explain.</i>) (4)
Soil/air		·		
l. Residents/others should avoid exposure to contaminated dust or other particulates on some days.		X		,
m. Residents are advised not to let children play/dig in their yards.		X		
n. Fences/barriers/signs are erected to keep residents or others out of contaminated areas.		¥		
o. Obnoxious odors are present.		χ		
Other conditions				
p. Trespassers, including children, may come into direct contact with contaminants.	X			
q. Workers or other legitimate visitors may come into direct contact with contaminants.	×			
r. Institutional restrictions are necessary because of the site's contamination (for example, a deed restriction limits the property to industrial use or a legal limit is placed on well depth).			×	_
s. Residents/community have concerns about contamination or potential health effects caused by this site.		X		

EPA activity at the site

8.	Has EP	A overseer	or funded	any of	the	
fol	lowing a	ctivities a	this site?	(Check	all	that
ф	oly.)					

1. [] R	Removing	waste	from	the	site
------	-----	----------	-------	------	-----	------

- 2. [] Taking other interim actions to mitigate the site's contamination
- 3. [] Constructing final cleanup
- 4. [] Other (Please specify.)
- 5. None of the above -> Skip to Question 10.
- 9. In what calendar year did the above site activities begin? (See previous question.) (Enter two digits.)

State/territorial/tribal activity at site

10. Has the state/territorial/tribal agency participated in evaluating and assessing this site (e.g., gathering information, hiring contractors)? (Check one.)

- 1. [X] Yes
 2. [] No
- 3. [] Don't know

11. Has EPA funded any assessment activities by the state/territory/tribe at this site? (Check one.)

- 3. [] Don't know

Site risk

12.	Please rate the	current r	isk to	human	health
and	the environment	posed by	y this	site. (C	lieck
one.	.)				

- 1. [] Very high risk
- 2. [] High
- 3. [] Average
- 4. [] Low
- 5. [] Very low risk
- 6. [] Too early to tell/Need more information to answer
- 7. [X] Other (Please explain.)

13. Please rate the potential risk to human health and the environment posed by this site if it is not cleaned up. (Check one.)

- 1. [] Very high risk
- 2. [] High
- 3. [] Average
- 4. [] Low
- 5. [] Very low risk
- 6. [] Too early to tell/Need more information to answer
- Other (Please explain.)

Status of site cleanup

be needed at the environm	this site to protect human health or nent? (Check one.)	responsible parties (PRPs) in this site's cleanu under what program(s) would this activity occ (Check all that apply.)	ıp,
	Definitely yes	1. [] Do not expect PRP participation	
	Probably yes Uncertain	2. [] CERCLA after placement on NP	Ľ
	Probably no	3. [] CERCLA without placement on NPL	
5. []	Definitely no	4. [] RCRA (including delegated to st	ate)
	Cannot say; depends on future spread of contamination	5. [] State/territorial/tribal program .	
7. [\[\]	Too early to tell/Need more information to answer	6. Too early to tell/Need more information to answer	
8. []	Other (Please explain.)	7. [] Other (Please specify.)	
		•	
complete all	up currently under way that will remediation needed at this site to un health and the environment?	 Which one of the following best described involvement of PRPs at this site? (Check one No PRP likely (orphan site, etc.) PRP(s) identified, but viability is uncertain 	?.))
complete all protect huma	remediation needed at this site to an health and the environment? Yes	involvement of PRPs at this site? (Check one 1. [] No PRP likely (orphan site, etc.) 2. [] PRP(s) identified, but viability is	s.) S
complete all protect huma (Check one.) 1. [] 2. [] 3. []	remediation needed at this site to an health and the environment? Yes	 involvement of PRPs at this site? (Check one 1. [] No PRP likely (orphan site, etc.) 2. [] PRP(s) identified, but viability is uncertain 3. [] PRP(s) identified, but cooperation 	e.) s on is
complete all protect huma (Check one.) 1. [] 2. [] 3. []	remediation needed at this site to an health and the environment? Yes No Cleanup is under way but it is too early to tell if more will be needed	 involvement of PRPs at this site? (Check one) [] No PRP likely (orphan site, etc.) [] PRP(s) identified, but viability is uncertain [] PRP(s) identified, but cooperation uncertain [] PRP(s) will participate in site's cleanup, but extent of participation 	e.) s on is
complete all protect huma (Check one.) 1. [] 2. [] 3. []	remediation needed at this site to an health and the environment? Yes No Cleanup is under way but it is too early to tell if more will be needed	 involvement of PRPs at this site? (Check one) [] No PRP likely (orphan site, etc.) [] PRP(s) identified, but viability is uncertain [] PRP(s) identified, but cooperation uncertain [] PRP(s) will participate in site's cleanup, but extent of participatin uncertain [] PRP(s) likely to clean up all or 	e.) s on is

PRP involvement at site

8. [] Other (Please specify.)

Opinions on site's placement on NPL

18. Considering EPA records and your professional opinion, will this site eventually be placed on the NPL? (Check one.)	19. In your professional opinion, which one of the following seems to be the most likely outcome for this site? (Check only one.)
1. [] Definitely yes	1. [] Cleanup as an NPL site
2. [] Probably yes	2. [] No NPL listing, but EPA conducts or oversees cleanup (RCRA,
3. [] Uncertain	removal, etc.)
4. [] Probably no	3. [] No NPL listing, but the state/ territory/tribe conducts or oversees
5. [] Definitely no	cleanup (enforcement, voluntary cleanup, state-funded cleanup, etc.)
6. [] Contamination no longer qualifies site	1, ,
for placement on the NPL	4. [] No cleanup conducted because not needed to protect human health and
7. Too early to tell/Need more information to answer	the environment
information to answer	•
8. [] Other (Please explain.)	 Further cleanup action is needed, but will not be conducted (due to limited resources, other priorities, etc.).
•	6. Too early to tell/Need more information to answer
·	7 () Other /Plance describe)

20. In your opinion, to what extent does each of the following statements currently explain why this site has not already been proposed for the NPL? (Check one for each row.)

(Check one for each row.)	Major factor (1)	Moderate factor (2)	Minor factor (3)	Not a factor (4)	No basis to judge (5)
a. We consider the state/territorial/tribal program to have the lead for the site.	X			·	
b. The state/territory/tribe told EPA that it plans to conduct or oversee cleanup.			·		χ
c. The state/territory/tribe is already conducting or overseeing further cleanup or assessment.					X
d. State/territory/tribe is waiting for resources to proceed with cleanup/further assessment.					X
e. We are waiting for the state/territory/tribe to provide necessary information.				*	
f. EPA's assessment resources are limited.				X	
g. EPA's resources for placing sites on the NPL are limited.				X	
h. EPA's cleanup resources are limited.				X	
 i. The state/territory/tribe is opposing inclusion on the NPL. 				X	•
j. The local government/community is opposing inclusion on the NPL.				X	·
k. We expect the site to be deferred to RCRA.				¥	
l. Our removal program is working on the site.				Y	
m. We are waiting for a federal agency (as PRP) to provide necessary information.				4	
n. We need to collect more information on the current risk at this site.				7	
o. Site is awaiting expanded site inspection (ESI).				X	
p. Site is undergoing ESI.				1	
q. Hazardous ranking system (HRS) package preparation is underway.				*	
r. Placing site on NPL is low priority because contamination does not currently threaten humans or the environment.				4	
s. We are waiting for a letter from the governor supporting placement on the NPL.				4	

21. For each contaminant listed below, please indicate the media in which it is present at this site, according to the site inspection records. For the contaminants that are not present or not assessed, check box 1, "Contaminant not present/not assessed." (Check all that apply.)

	(1) Contaminant not present/ not assessed	(2) Air	(3) Soil	(4) Groundwater	(5) Surface water	(6) Other (incl. sediment, biota)
a. Metals		·	EX	X		X
b. Pesticides			X			
c. VOCs			X			
d. SVOCs			X			
e. PCBs						
f. Dioxin						
g. Other						

Abbreviations:

VOCs -- volatile organic compounds SVOCs -- semivolatile organic compounds PCBs -- polychlorinated biphenyls

most recent information that you used to answer this survey? (Check one.)	survey. You may use the space below to add comments.
1. [] 1990 or earlier	
2. [] 1991	
3. [] 1992	,
4. [] 1993	
5. [] 1994	
6. [×] 1995	
7. [] 1996	
8. [] 1997	
9. [] Other (Please explain.)	
23. Please consider the information sources that you used to complete this survey and indicate the category below that most closely fits your situation. (Check one.)	
1. [X] Used site records only; have no other experience with this site	

22. What is the approximate calendar year of the

2. [] Used my own knowledge of this site and site records as needed

3. [] Other (Please explain.)

24. Thank you for your assistance with this